

JUL 30 1966

STATINTL

## DODD SAYS INCOME IS DOWN FROM '65

Links Decline to Attacks by Pearson and Anderson

WASHINGTON, July 29 (AP)—Attorneys for Senator Thomas J. Dodd listed his 1965 net income today as \$50,650 and said it dropped sharply this year as a result of attacks by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, the columnists.

Senator Dodd appeared at a deposition proceeding, part of the preliminaries to his \$2-million libel suit against the columnists. The session was a closed one, but newsmen obtained versions of what took place.

John F. Sonnett, Senator Dodd's attorney, introduced a financial statement he had prepared from the Connecticut Democrat's records. This showed 1965 receipts as follows:

Net income from the Government, \$29,500; from 19 speaking engagements, \$11,000; for broadcast recordings for the American Security Council, anti-Communist organization, \$2,000; for magazine articles, \$2,000; from six law clients Senator Dodd represented on non-Federal matters, \$10,360.

### \$8,000 Off for Expenses

After the subtraction of business expenses of some \$8,000 the net receipts were \$50,650, the statement said.

Concerning his law practice Senator Dodd said:

"No one has approached me on any legal business this year."

He added that he could not remember receiving any request to make speeches since the Pearson and Anderson columns, accusing him of misconduct in office, began to appear.

Mr. Anderson, who attended the proceeding as a participant in the suit, said Senator Dodd was refusing to answer questions about what the columnists contend are large additional amounts of income. They contend that the Senator devoted large sums in campaign contributions to his own personal use, without paying income taxes on them.

Mr. Sonnett accused the defendants of trying to create "a Roman holiday." While not conceding that Senator Dodd had converted campaign funds to his own use, Mr. Sonnett contends that that is not at issue in a libel suit.

Mr. Anderson told newsmen there was a dispute in the closed session when a question was asked whether Senator Dodd, in 1965, received \$8,000 given on behalf of A. N. Spanel, founder of the International Latex Corporation.

Mr. Anderson said Senator Dodd had answered "no" when asked whether he received such a sum "as income." But, Mr. Anderson continued, Senator Dodd had, on the advice of Mr. Sonnett, refused to answer when the question was phrased without the "as income" qualification.

### A Limited Complaint

Mr. Sonnett contends that such questions are outside the scope of the libel suit. He has said that in an effort to speed a decision, Senator Dodd has limited his complaint in the suit to certain matters.

These include his charge that the columnists conspired with some of his former employees to steal papers from his office and that they falsely alleged he acted as "errand boy" for Julius Klein, a public relations man, in return for expensive gifts.

Senator Dodd was asked whether he had received any oriental rugs before 1965 through a dealer in Washington. He said he had no such recollection; that the only oriental rug he recalled before 1965 was a runner obtained from a relative in Connecticut.

Mrs. Dodd had said that in 1965 she bought oriental scatter rugs for their home in Georgetown and paid for them.

At yesterday's deposition hearing, Mr. Sonnett reportedly objected to the introduction of documents bearing on dealings between Senator Dodd and Mr. Klein.

Mr. Anderson quoted Mr. Sonnett as saying the documents were tainted, a charge that Mr. Anderson denied.

Mr. Sonnett told newsmen the documents had been taken from Senator Dodd's office in an "unlawful search and seizure," and that under the law those who do such things cannot enjoy the fruits of their acts.